arXiv:math/0206236v2 [math.GR] 5 Dec 2002

ON DENSE FREE SUBGROUPS OF LIE GROUPS

E. BREUILLARD, T. GELANDER

Abstract. We give a method for constructing dense and free subgroups in real Lie groups. In particular we show that any dense subgroup of a connected semisimple real Lie group G contains a free group on two generators which is still dense in G, and that any finitely generated dense subgroup in a connected non-solvable Lie group H contains a dense free subgroup of rank $\leq 2 \cdot \dim H$. As an application, we obtain a new and elementary proof of a conjecture of Connes and Sullivan on amenable actions, which was first proved by Zimmer.

1. Introduction

The main purpose of this paper is to give a proof of the following statement:

Theorem 1.1. *Let G be a connected semi-simple real Lie group and Γ a dense subgroup of G. Then Γ contains two elements which generate a dense free subgroup of G.*

We shall also give the following generalizations of this result:

Theorem 1.2. *Let G be a connected real Lie group which is topologically perfect (i.e. the commutator $[G,G]$ is dense in G). If its Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ is generated by l elements, then any dense subgroup contains a dense free subgroup of rank l.*

Theorem 1.3. *Let G be a connected non solvable real Lie group of dimension d. Then any finitely generated dense subgroup of G contains a dense free subgroup of rank $2d$.*

The finite generation assumption in 1.3 is crucial. Moreover, as it will be clear from the proofs, one can find a free dense subgroup of rank k, for any integer $k \geq l$ in theorem 1.2 (resp. $k \geq 2d$ in theorem 1.3). For some particular groups G one can give a smaller bound for the rank of the dense free subgroup than the bounds l and $2d$ given in 1.2 and 1.3. We will give examples to illustrate these facts.

Date: January 2002.

Theorem 1.1 was originally motivated by a conjecture in the theory of amenable actions of groups on measure spaces. It answers a question first raised by Carrière and Ghys (see [8]) in a note from 1985 on amenable actions. The authors learned about this question from A. Lubotzky. Combined with [8] theorem 2, it gives a direct proof of the following theorem:

Theorem 1.4. *Let G be a real Lie group and Γ a countable subgroup. Then the action of Γ on G (or on G/P for P closed amenable) by left translations is amenable if and only if the connected component of the closure of Γ in G is solvable.*

This result was first conjectured by Connes and Sullivan (see [8]) and subsequently proved by Zimmer in [13] using the techniques of super-rigidity theory. In their note, Carrière and Ghys show that a non-discrete free subgroup of a real Lie group cannot act amenably by left translations on the Lie group (see [8], theorem 2) and then give a quick proof of theorem 1.1 in the case $G = SL_2(\mathbb{R})$, hence proving theorem 1.4 for $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$.

A celebrated theorem of Tits (see [12]), asserts that any Zariski-dense subgroup of a semisimple algebraic group G over a field of characteristic zero contains a Zariski-dense free subgroup on two generators. Theorem 1.1 can then be viewed as a kind of topological version of Tits' theorem. The difficulty of the problem we are considering comes from the fact that the free group obtained in Tits' proof is in general discrete. In this paper, we give a practical method for constructing free generators of a free group in Zariski dense subsets of G (see theorem 4.5). As an application, we then obtain theorems 1.1 to 1.3. One can also easily derive from it the original statement of Tits' alternative. The proof relies on a careful study of the so-called "proximal" elements in Γ acting on a projective space over some local field. Unlike in Tits' paper, where powers of suitable semisimple elements are used to produce proximal elements, our method is inspired from that of Abels-Margulis-Soifer (see [1]), which is based on the Cartan decomposition of projective transformations.

In section 2, we give a simple method for producing finitely generated dense subgroups in connected real Lie groups. Section 3 is devoted to the study of proximal transformations in projective spaces over local fields. We give some quantitative estimates that enable us to exhibit proximal elements with nice properties. These two sections can be read independently. In section 4 we explain how to find a suitable linear representation of Γ and elements in Γ which have a nice proximal action on the corresponding projective space. Finally, the last section contains the proof of the three theorems above.

Let us make one remark about terminology.

Remark 1.5. In this paper, we use both the usual real topology (or the Hausdorff topology induced by a local field k) and the Zariski topology on the groups considered. To avoid confusion, we shall add the prefix Zariski- to any topological notion regarding the Zariski topology (Zariski-connected, Zariski-dense, etc.). For the real topology, however, we shall plainly say "dense" or "open" without further notice. Note that the Zariski topology on rational points does not depend on the field of definition, i.e. if V is an algebraic variety defined over a field K and if L is any extension of K, then the K-Zariski topology on $V(K)$ coincide with the trace of the L-Zariski topology on it.

2. Generating dense subgroups in Lie groups

We call a connected Lie group G **topologically perfect** if its commutator group $[G, G]$ is dense, or equivalently, if G has no continuous surjective homomorphism to the circle.

The following result shows that, in a topologically perfect group, elements which lie near the identity generate a dense subgroup, unless they have some algebraic reason not to. Similar statements were established by Kuranishi (see [9]).

Theorem 2.1 (Generating dense subgroups in topologically perfect groups)**.** *Let G be a connected topologically perfect real Lie group with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$. Then there is an identity neighborhood $\Omega \subset G$, on which $\log = \exp^{-1}$ is a well defined diffeomorphism, such that $g_1, \ldots, g_m \in \Omega$ generate a dense subgroup whenever $\log(g_1), \ldots, \log(g_m)$ generate $\mathfrak{g}$.*

Proof. Recall that a Zassenhaus neighborhood of a real Lie group is an identity neighborhood Ω for which the intersection $\Omega \cap \Sigma$ with any discrete subgroup Σ is contained in a connected nilpotent Lie subgroup. A classical theorem of Kazhdan and Margulis (see [11] 8.16) says that a Zassenhaus neighborhood always exists. Checking the details of the proof of the Kazhdan-Margulis theorem, one can easily verify that the identity neighborhood Ω established there, satisfies the stronger property that its image under any surjective homomorphism f is a Zassenhaus neighborhood in the image group (this is because the properties of the neighborhoods established in 8.18 and 8.20 in [11] are inherited to their images). Moreover, as in [11], one writes $\Omega = \exp V$ for a suitable neighborhood V of 0 in $\mathfrak{g}$, and then, a subset $\{X_1, \ldots, X_p\} \subset (df)(V)$ generates a nilpotent Lie subalgebra iff $\exp(X_1), \ldots, \exp(X_p)$ generate a nilpotent subgroup in $f(G)$. We shall call such an Ω a *strongly Zassenhaus neighborhood*.

Let Ω be a strongly Zassenhaus neighborhood in G, and assume that it is small enough so that $\log|_\Omega$ is a well defined diffeomorphism. Pick $g_1, \dots, g_m \in \Omega$ for which $\log(g_1), \dots, \log(g_m)$ generate $\mathfrak{g}$. Denote by A the closure of $\langle g_1, \dots, g_m \rangle$, and by A^0 its identity component. We need to show that $A^0 = G$.

First observe that A^0 is normal in G, i.e. its Lie subalgebra $\mathfrak{a}$ is an ideal in $\mathfrak{g}$. Indeed, since $\mathfrak{g} = \langle \log(g_i) \rangle$, it is enough to show that $\mathrm{ad}\big(\log(g_i)\big)(\mathfrak{a}) = \mathfrak{a}$ for any $1 \le i \le m$, but

$$\mathrm{ad}(\log g_i)(\mathfrak{a}) = \big(\log \mathrm{Ad}(g_i)\big)(\mathfrak{a}),$$

and since $g_i \in A$, it normalizes A^0, i.e. $\mathrm{Ad}(g_i)(\mathfrak{a}) = \mathfrak{a}$, which implies also that $\big(\log \mathrm{Ad}(g_i)\big)(\mathfrak{a}) = \mathfrak{a}$.

Next consider the quotient map $f : G \to G/A^0$. Clearly, $f\big(\langle g_1, \dots, g_m \rangle\big) = f(A)$ is discrete, and generated by the set $\{f(g_1), \dots, f(g_m)\}$ which is contained in the Zassenhaus neighborhood $f(\Omega)$. Therefore $f\big(\langle g_1, \dots, g_m \rangle\big)$ is a nilpotent group, but this means that

$$\log f(g_i) = (df)(\log g_i),\ i = 1, \dots, m$$

generate a nilpotent Lie algebra. As $\{(df)(\log g_i)\}_{i=1}^m$ generate $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{a}$, this implies that G/A^0 is nilpotent. Since G is assumed to be topologically perfect, any nilpotent quotient is trivial. Thus $G = A^0$ and $\langle g_1, \dots, g_m \rangle$ is dense. $\square$

In fact, it is enough to require that $\log(g_1), \dots, \log(g_m)$ generate a Lie subalgebra which corresponds to a dense Lie subgroup. This phenomenon is illustrated by the following:

Example 2.2. Let $\widetilde{\mathrm{SL}}_2(\mathbb{R})$ be the universal covering of $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$, and let $a \in \widetilde{\mathrm{SL}}_2(\mathbb{R})$ be a central element of infinite order. Let α be an irrational rotation in the circle group $\mathbb{T}$. Consider the group

$$G = \big(\widetilde{\mathrm{SL}}_2(\mathbb{R}) \times \mathbb{T}\big)/\langle (a, \alpha) \rangle.$$

G is an example of a topologically perfect non-perfect group. Its Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g} \cong \mathrm{sl}_2(\mathbb{R}) \oplus \mathbb{R}$ is not generated by 2 elements, but the 2-generated Lie subalgebra $\mathrm{sl}_2(\mathbb{R})$ corresponds to a dense Lie subgroup in G. Theorem 1.2 guarantees only that any dense subgroup of G contains a dense F_3, however, it is possible to show (by the same argument which proves theorem 1.1) that there is always a dense F_2.

However, in general, 2 generators are not enough. This phenomenon is illustrated by the following:

Example 2.3. Consider the complex Lie group $G = \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C}) \cdot (\mathbb{C}^2)^5$, with the ordinary action on $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ on each of the 5 copies of $\mathbb{C}^2$. It is easy to verify that

(1) G is perfect, i.e. $[G,G]=G$.
(2) The exponential map is onto.
(3) Any 2 elements in G's Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}=\mathrm{sl}_2(\mathbb{C})\cdot(\mathbb{C}^2)^5$ generate a Lie subalgebra for which the closure of the corresponding Lie subgroup is proper.

These properties imply that there is no 2-generated dense subgroup in G.

It is well known that a real semisimple Lie algebra is generated by 2 elements (cf. [9] or [3] VIII, 3, ex. 10). In fact $V=\{(X,Y)\in\mathfrak{g}\times\mathfrak{g}:\langle X,Y\rangle\neq\mathfrak{g}\}$ is a proper algebraic subset. We therefore obtain:

Theorem 2.4 (Generating dense subgroups in semisimple groups)**.** *Let G be a connected semisimple Lie group. Then there exists an identity neighborhood $\Omega\subset G$, and a proper exponential algebraic subvariety $R\subset\Omega\times\Omega$ such that $\langle x,y\rangle$ is dense in G whenever $(x,y)\in\Omega\times\Omega\setminus R$.*

Theorem 2.1 yields a lot of freedom in the procedure of generating dense subgroups in topologically perfect groups. In fact, if G is a topologically perfect Lie group and $g_1,\ldots,g_m\in G$ are elements close enough to 1 for which $\log(g_1),\ldots,\log(g_m)$ generate the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$, and if $U\subset G$ is a sufficiently small identity neighborhood, then for any selections $h_i\in g_i\cdot U$, $\log(h_1),\ldots,\log(h_m)$ generate $\mathfrak{g}$, and $h_1,\ldots,h_m$ generate a dense subgroup in G. In particular, we obtain:

Corollary 2.5. *If G is a topologically perfect Lie group for which the Lie algebra is generated by m elements, then any dense subgroup in G contains a m-generated dense subgroup.*

Proof. Let $g_1,\ldots,g_m$ and U be as in the last paragraph above. Clearly, if $\Gamma\leq G$ is a dense subgroup then $\Gamma\cap g_i\cdot U\neq\emptyset$. Pick $h_i\in\Gamma\cap g_i\cdot U$, $i=1,\ldots,m$ then $\langle h_1,\ldots,h_m\rangle$ is dense. □

The requirement that G is topologically perfect is crucial for corollary 2.5 as explained by the following remark:

Remark 2.6. If a connected Lie group G is not topologically perfect then it has a surjective homomorphism to the circle. Let $\Gamma\leq G$ be the pre-image of the group of rational rotations. Clearly Γ is dense in G but, as any finitely generated group of rational rotations is finite, Γ has no finitely generated dense subgroup.

This remark explains why, when G is not topologically perfect, we shall consider only *finitely generated* dense subgroups. Then we can control the number of generators, by the following reasoning.

Proposition 2.7. *Let G be a connected Lie group and $\Gamma\leq G$ a finitely generated dense subgroup. Then Γ contains a dense subgroup on $2\dim G$*

generators. If G is compact then Γ contains a dense subgroup on $\dim G$ generators.

Proof. Assume first that G is abelian. Then $G = \mathbb{R}^{d_1} \times \mathbb{T}^{d_2}$ and we can find d_1 elements in Γ which generate a discrete cocompact subgroup. Dividing by this subgroup, we may assume that G is a torus. Then we argue by induction on $\dim G$. As Γ is finitely generated and dense it contains an element γ of infinite order. By replacing γ by some power γ^j if necessary, we obtain an element which generates a subgroup with connected closure C of positive dimension. By induction, the proposition holds for G/C. Lift arbitrarily to G a set of $\dim G/C$ generators for a dense subgroup of the image of Γ in G/C. Together with γ they generate a dense subgroup in G.

For the general case, we argue as follows. Consider the sequence $G_{i+1} = \overline{[G_i, G_i]}$, where $[G_i, G_i]$ is the commutator group of G_i, starting at $G_0 = G$. As $\dim G$ is finite this sequence stabilizes at some finite step k. Then G_k is a connected closed normal topologically perfect subgroup. Moreover the commutator $[\Gamma, \Gamma]$ is a finitely generated dense subgroup in G_1, and similarly, the i'th commutator of Γ is a finitely generated dense subgroup in G_i. Thus, by the above paragraph, we can find, for each i, $0 \leq i < k$, a set Σ_i of $2 \dim G_i/G_{i+1}$ (or $\dim G_i/G_{i+1}$ in the compact case) elements in $G_i \cap \Gamma$ which projects to generators of a dense subgroup in the abelian group G_i/G_{i+1}. Additionally, by corollary 2.5 there is a set Σ_k of $\dim G_k$ elements in $\Gamma \cap G_k$ which generate a dense subgroup of G_k (in the non-abelian compact case $G_k = G_1$ is semisimple and we can take Σ_k of size 2).

Clearly $\bigcup_{i=0}^{k} \Sigma_i$ generates a dense subgroup and has the required cardinality. □

3. Projective transformations, proximality, ping-pong

Let k be a local field equipped with an absolute value $|\cdot|$. We wish to investigate the action of projective transformations in $\mathrm{PSL}_n(k)$ on the projective space $\mathbb{P}^{n-1}(k)$. We shall start by recalling the Cartan decomposition, i.e. the KAK decomposition in $\mathrm{SL}_n(k)$, and introducing a nice metric on the projective space $\mathbb{P}^{n-1}(k)$.

(1) Consider first the case when k is archimedean, i.e. $k = \mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{C}$. We shall denote by $\|\cdot\|$ the canonical euclidean (resp. hermitian) norm on k^n, i.e. $\|x\|^2 = \sum |x_i|^2$ if $x = \sum x_i e_i$, where $(e_1, ..., e_n)$ is the canonical basis of k^n. The Cartan decomposition in $\mathrm{SL}_n(k)$ reads

$$\mathrm{SL}_n(k) = KAK$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned} K &= \mathrm{SO}_n(\mathbb{R}) \text{ or } \mathrm{SU}_n(\mathbb{C}) \text{ according to whether } k = \mathbb{R} \text{ or } \mathbb{C}, \\ \text{and } A &= \{\mathrm{diag}(a_1, \ldots, a_n) : a_1 \geq \ldots \geq a_n > 0, \prod a_i = 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

Any element $g \in \mathrm{SL}_n(k)$ can be decomposed as a product $g = k_g a_g k'_g$, where $k_g, k'_g \in K$ and $a_g \in A$. We remark that a_g is uniquely determined by g, but k_g, k'_g are not. Even so, we shall use the subscript g to indicate the relation to g.

(2) Next, consider the case where k is non-archimedean with valuation ring $\mathcal{O}_k$ and uniformizer π. We endow k^n with the canonical norm defined by $\|x\| = \max |x_i|$, where $x = \sum x_i e_i$ is the expansion of x with respect to the canonical basis $(e_1, ..., e_n)$ of k^n. Then we get

$$\mathrm{SL}_n(k) = KAK$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} K &= \mathrm{SL}_n(\mathcal{O}_k), \\ \text{and } A &= \{\mathrm{diag}(\pi^{j_1}, \ldots, \pi^{j_n}) : j_i \in \mathbb{Z}, j_i \leq j_{i+1}, \sum j_i = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Any $g \in \mathrm{SL}_n(k)$ can be decomposed as a product $g = k_g a_g k'_g$, where $k_g, k'_g \in K$ and $a_g \in A$ (see [10] page 150, or [4] 4.4.3.). Again a_g is uniquely determined, but k_g, k'_g are not.

In both cases, the canonical norm on k^n gives rise to the associated canonical norm on $\bigwedge^2 k^n$. We shall then define the *standard metric* on $\mathbb{P}^{n-1}(k)$ by the formula

$$d\big([v],[w]\big) = \frac{\|v \wedge w\|}{\|v\| \cdot \|w\|}$$

This is well defined and satisfies the following properties:

- d is a distance on $\mathbb{P}^{n-1}(k)$ which induces the canonical topology inherited from the local field k.
- d is a ultra-metric distance if k is non-archimedean, i.e.

$$d\big([v],[w]\big) \leq \max\{d\big([v],[u]\big), d\big([u],[w]\big)\}$$

for any non-zero vectors u, v and w in k^n.

- If f is a linear form $k^n \to k$, then for any non-zero vector $v \in k^n$,

$$d\big([v],[\ker f]\big) = \frac{|f(v)|}{\|f\| \cdot \|v\|} \tag{1}$$

- the compact group K acts by isometries on $\big(\mathbb{P}^{n-1}(k), d\big)$.

In the sequel, we shall denote by $a_1(g), ..., a_n(g)$ the coefficients of the diagonal matrix a_g corresponding to g in the Cartan decomposition. For further use, we note that in the above notations, for any matrix $g \in \mathrm{SL}_n(k)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|g\| &= |a_1(g)| \\ \left\|\bigwedge^2 g\right\| &= |a_1(g)a_2(g)|. \end{aligned}$$

Let us observe a few properties of projective transformations. For $g \in \mathrm{SL}_n(k)$ we denote by $[g]$ the corresponding projective transformation $[g] \in \mathrm{PSL}_n(k)$.

Lemma 3.1. *Every projective transformation is bi-Lipschitz on the entire projective space for some constant depending on the transformation.*

Proof. As the compact group K acts by isometries on $\mathbb{P}^{n-1}(k)$, the KAK decomposition allows us to assume that $g = a_g = diag(a_1, ..., a_n) \in A$. Thus, one only needs to check the easy fact that a_g is $\left|\frac{a_1}{a_n}\right|^2$-Lipschitz. □

Definition 3.2. Let $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. A projective transformation $[g] \in \mathrm{PSL}_n(k)$ is called **ϵ-contracting** if there exist a point $v_g \in \mathbb{P}^{n-1}(k)$, called an **attracting point** of $[g]$, and a projective hyperplane H_g, called a **repulsive hyperplane** of $[g]$, such that $[g]$ maps the complement of the ϵ-neighborhood of $H_g \subset \mathbb{P}^{n-1}(k)$ into the ϵ-ball around v_g. We say that $[g]$ is **ϵ-very contracting** if both $[g]$ and $[g^{-1}]$ are ϵ-contracting.

Note that in general v_g and H_g are not necessarily unique. Nevertheless, all the statements we shall make about them will be valid for any choice.

The following proposition shows that "ϵ-contraction" is equivalent to "a big ratio between the first and second diagonal terms in the KAK decomposition."

Proposition 3.3. *Let $\epsilon < \frac{1}{4}$. If $|\frac{a_2(g)}{a_1(g)}| \leq \epsilon^2$, then $[g]$ is ϵ-contracting. More precisely, writing $g = k_g a_g k'_g$, one can take H_g to be the projective hyperplane spanned by $\{{k'_g}^{-1}(e_i)\}_{i=2}^n$, and $v_g = [k_g(e_1)]$.*

Conversely, suppose $[g]$ is ϵ-contracting and k is non-archimedean with uniformizer π (resp. archimedean), then $|\frac{a_2(g)}{a_1(g)}| \leq \frac{\epsilon^2}{|\pi|}$ (resp. $|\frac{a_2(g)}{a_1(g)}| \leq 4\epsilon^2$).

Proof. Suppose that $|\frac{a_2(g)}{a_1(g)}| \leq \epsilon^2$. Using the Cartan decomposition and the fact that K acts by isometries, we can again assume that

$$g = a_g = diag(a_1, ..., a_n)$$

Let $[v] \in \mathbb{P}^{n-1}(k)$ be outside the ϵ-neighborhood of H_g, which, in our case, simply means that (cf. (1))

$$d([v], H_g) = \frac{|v_1|}{\|v\|} \geq \epsilon$$

Then

$$d([gv], [e_1]) = \frac{\|gv \wedge e_1\|}{\|gv\|} \leq \frac{|a_2| \cdot \|v\|}{|a_1| \cdot |v_1|} \leq \epsilon$$

since $\|gv \wedge e_1\| \leq |a_2| \, \|v\|$ and $\|gv\| \geq |a_1 v_1|$.

The converse is more delicate. We shall describe the non-archimedean case, and remark that the archimedean case can be dealt with in an analogous way. Again we can take $g = a_g$. Let $f = (f_1, ..., f_n)$ be a linear form of norm 1 such that $\ker(f) = H_g$ and let $w \in k^n$ be a normalized representative of the attracting point v_g. The fact that $[g]$ is ϵ-contracting means that for every non-zero vector $v \in k^n$

$$|f(v)| \geq \epsilon \, \|v\| \Rightarrow \|gv \wedge w\| \leq \epsilon \, \|gv\| \, . \tag{2}$$

Suppose that for some index i_0, $|f_{i_0}| \geq \epsilon$. Take $v = e_{i_0}$ and get that

$$|a_{i_0}| \, \|e_{i_0} \wedge w\| \leq \epsilon \, |a_{i_0}|$$

So $\|e_{i_0} \wedge w\| = \max_{i \neq i_0} |w_i| \leq \epsilon$ and hence $|w_{i_0}| = 1$, and i_0 is unique. Since $\|f\| = \max |f_i| = 1$, we must then have $|f_{i_0}| = 1$ and $\max_{i \neq i_0} |f_i| < \epsilon$.

We now claim that $i_0 = 1$. Suppose the contrary and take $v = e_1 + e_{i_0}$. Then $\|v\| = 1$ and $f(v) = f_1 + f_{i_0}$. Since $|f_{i_0}| = 1 \geq \epsilon > |f_1|$ we indeed have

$$|f(v)| \geq \epsilon \, \|v\|$$

Hence, by (2), we obtain

$$\|a_1 e_1 \wedge w + a_{i_0} e_{i_0} \wedge w\| \leq \epsilon \, \|a_1 e_1 + a_{i_0} e_{i_0}\|$$

which also reads

$$|a_1| \leq \epsilon \, |a_1|$$

and gives the desired contradiction.

Finally take $v = x e_1 + e_2$, where $x \in k$ is chosen such that $|x|$ is least possible and $\geq \epsilon$. Then $\|v\| = 1$ and $f(v) = x f_1 + f_2$. Since $|x f_1| \geq \epsilon > |f_2|$ we have

$$|f(v)| \geq \epsilon \, \|v\|$$

and, again, by (2), we obtain

$$\|x a_1 e_1 \wedge w + a_2 e_2 \wedge w\| \leq \epsilon \, \|x a_1 e_1 + a_2 e_2\|$$

Suppose $|a_2| > \epsilon \, |x| \, |a_1|$ then the last inequality translates to

$$|a_2| \leq \epsilon \max\{|x a_1| \, , |a_2|\}$$

which leads to either $|a_2| \leq \epsilon\,|a_2|$, which is absurd, or $|a_2| \leq \epsilon\,|x| \cdot |a_1|$, which contradicts the assumption.

Therefore we have obtained that $|a_2| \leq \epsilon\,|x|\,|a_1|$, which, considering the choice of x, implies the desired conclusion:

$$\left|\frac{a_2}{a_1}\right| \leq \frac{\epsilon^2}{|\pi|}$$

□

Note that the factor $|\pi|$ is not necessary when ϵ belongs to the value group of k.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $r, \epsilon \in (0,1]$. If $|\frac{a_2(g)}{a_1(g)}| \leq \epsilon$, then $[g]$ is $\frac{\epsilon}{r^2}$-Lipschitz outside the r-neighborhood of the repulsive hyperplane $H_g = [span\{k'^{-1}_g(e_i)\}_{i=2}^n]$.*

Proof. Again, we can assume $g = a_g$, $v_g = [e_1]$, $H_g = [span(e_i)_{i\geq 2}]$. Let v, w be arbitrary non-zero vectors in k^n. Then $\|gv \wedge gw\| \leq |a_1 a_2|\,\|v \wedge w\|$ and $\|gv\| \geq |a_1 v_1|$ and $\|gw\| \geq |a_1 w_1|$. Therefore

$$d\big([gv],[gw]\big) \leq \frac{|a_2| \cdot \|v\| \cdot \|w\|}{|a_1| \cdot |v_1| \cdot |w_1|} d\big([v],[w]\big). \tag{3}$$

We conclude by observing that the r-neighborhood of $H_g = [span(e_i)_{i\geq 2}]$ corresponds to non-zero vectors v for which $|v_1| \leq r\,\|v\|$. □

Note in particular that if $\delta > 0$, any projective transformation $[g] \in \mathrm{PSL}_n(k)$ is $(1+\delta)$-Lipschitz in some open set of $\mathbb{P}^{n-1}(k)$.

The following lemma gives a converse statement to the last result as well as a handy criterion for ϵ-contraction.

Lemma 3.5. *Let $[g]$ be a projective transformation corresponding to $g \in SL_n(k)$, and assume that the restriction of $[g]$ to some open set $O \subset \mathbb{P}^{n-1}(k)$ is ϵ-Lipschitz for some $\epsilon < 1$, then $|\frac{a_2(g)}{a_1(g)}| \leq \epsilon$ when k is non-archimedean, and $|\frac{a_2(g)}{a_1(g)}| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{1-\epsilon^2}}$ when k is archimedean.*

Proof. Once again, we may assume $g = a_g$. Let v be a non-zero vector in k^n such that $[v] \in O$. For some $\delta \in k\backslash\{0\}$ small enough, both $[w_1] = [v + \delta e_1]$ and $[w_2] = [v + \delta e_2]$ belong to O. Hence, for w_1

$$|\delta a_1|\,\frac{\|av \wedge e_1\|}{\|av\| \cdot \|aw_1\|} = d\big([av],[aw_1]\big) \leq \epsilon \cdot d\big([v],[w_1]\big) = \epsilon\,|\delta|\,\frac{\|v \wedge e_1\|}{\|v\| \cdot \|w_1\|} \tag{4}$$

thus

$$\frac{\|av \wedge e_1\|}{\|av\|} \leq \epsilon$$

In the non-archimedean case, this implies $|a_1 v_1| = \|av\|$, and in the archimedean case, $\|av \wedge e_2\| \geq |a_1 v_1| \geq \sqrt{1-\epsilon^2}\,\|av\|$. Now, expressing the Lipschitz condition for v and w_2 as in (4) yields

$$|a_2|\,\frac{\|av \wedge e_2\|}{\|av\|} \leq \epsilon\,|a_1|$$

which, in the non-archimedean case gives $|a_2/a_1| \leq \epsilon$ and in the archimedean case, $|a_2/a_1| \leq \epsilon/\sqrt{1-\epsilon^2}$. □

Definition 3.6. A projective transformation $[g] \in \mathrm{PSL}_n(k)$ is called (r,ϵ)-**proximal** $(r > 2\epsilon > 0)$ if it is ϵ-contracting with respect to some attracting point $v_g \in \mathbb{P}^{n-1}(k)$ and some repulsive hyperplane H_g, such that $d(v_g, H_g) \geq r$. The transformation $[g]$ is called (r,ϵ)-**very proximal** if both $[g]$ and $[g]^{-1}$ are (r,ϵ)-proximal.

Similar notions of (r,ϵ)-proximality were defined in [1] and [2].

Definition 3.7. A *finite* subset $F \subset \mathrm{PSL}_n(k)$ is called (m,r)-**separating** $(r > 0,\ m \in \mathbb{N})$ if for every choice of $2m$ points $v_1, ..., v_{2m}$ in $\mathbb{P}^{n-1}(k)$ and $2m$ projective hyperplanes $H_1, ..., H_{2m}$ there exists $\gamma \in F$ such that

$$\min_{1 \leq i,j \leq 2m} \{d(\gamma v_i, H_j), d(\gamma^{-1} v_i, H_j)\} > r.$$

We use the properties described above in order to construct ϵ-very contracting and (r,ϵ)-very proximal elements from two basic ingredients : an ϵ-contracting element and an r-separating set.

Proposition 3.8. *Let F be a $(1,r)$-separating set $(r < 1)$ in $PSL_n(k)$ with uniform bi-Lipschitz constant $C = \max\{biLip([f]) : [f] \in F\}$ (see lemma 3.1).*

(i) If $\epsilon < \frac{r}{2C}$ and $[g] \in PSL_n(k)$ is an ϵ-contracting transformation, then one can find $[f] \in F$ such that $[fg]$ is $(r, C\epsilon)$-proximal.

(ii) Let $d = 4$ when k is archimedean and $d = \frac{1}{|\pi|}$ when k is non-archimedean. If $\epsilon < \frac{r}{\sqrt{2Cd}}$ and $[g] \in PSL_n(k)$ is ϵ-contracting, then there is an element $[f] \in F$, such that

$$[gfg^{-1}]$$

is $\frac{\sqrt{2Cd}}{r}\epsilon$-very contracting.

(iii) If $\epsilon < \frac{r}{2C^2}$ and $[g] \in PSL_n(k)$ is an ϵ-very contracting transformation, then there is an element $[f] \in F$, such that $[gf]$ is $(\frac{r}{C}, C\epsilon)$-very proximal.

Proof. Let v_g (resp. H_g) be an attracting point (resp. repulsive hyperplane) corresponding to the transformation $[g]$. Let $[f] \in F$ be such that $d([f]v_g, H_g) > r$. Then $[fg]$ is clearly $C\epsilon$-contracting with attracting point

$[f]v_g$ and repulsive hyperplane H_g. The choice of f guarantees that $[fg]$ is $(r, C\epsilon)$-proximal. This proves (i).

By lemma 3.4 and the remark following it, there is an open set O on which $[g^{-1}]$ is, say, $\sqrt{2}$-Lipschitz. Let $[u]$ be some point inside O. We can find $[f] \in F$ such that $d([fg^{-1}u], H_g) > r$ and $d([f^{-1}g^{-1}u], H_g) > r$. Since $[g]$ is ϵ-contracting, by proposition 3.3 we have $\left|\frac{a_2(g)}{a_1(g)}\right| \leq d\epsilon^2$. Hence by lemma 3.4, $[g]$ is $\frac{d\epsilon^2}{r^2}$-Lipschitz outside the r-neighborhood of H_g. Therefore both $[gfg^{-1}]$ and $[gf^{-1}g^{-1}]$ are $\frac{dC\sqrt{2}\epsilon^2}{r^2}$–Lipschitz in some open neighborhood of $[u]$, which implies by lemma 3.5, that they both satisfy $\frac{|a_2|}{|a_1|} \leq 2\frac{dC\epsilon^2}{r^2}$. By proposition 3.3 it now follows that they are both $\frac{\sqrt{2Cd}}{r}\epsilon$-contracting transformations. This proves (ii).

Find $[f] \in F$ which takes v_g at least r away from H_g and for which $[f^{-1}]$ takes $v_{g^{-1}}$ at least r away from $H_{g^{-1}}$. Then $[gf]$ is $(\frac{r}{C}, C\epsilon)$-proximal and $[f^{-1}g^{-1}]$ is $(r, C\epsilon)$-proximal. Hence $[gf]$ is $(\frac{r}{C}, C\epsilon)$-very proximal. This proves (iii).

□

We end this section by showing how to obtain generators of a free group via the so-called ping-pong lemma, once we are given a very contracting element and a separating set. The following definition and lemma are classical (cf. [12]).

Definition 3.9 (Ping-pong pair)**.** Let k be a local field and V a finite dimensional k-vector space. A pair of projective transformations $a, b \in \mathrm{PSL}(V)$ is called a **ping-pong pair** if both a and b are (r, ϵ)-very proximal, with respect to some $r > 2\epsilon > 0$, and if the attracting points of a and a^{-1} (resp. of b and b^{-1}) are at least r-apart from the repulsive hyperplanes of b and b^{-1} (resp. of a and a^{-1}).

More generally, a m-tuple of projective transformations $a_1, \ldots, a_m$ is called a **ping-pong m-tuple** if all a_i's are (r, ϵ)-very proximal (for some $r > 2\epsilon > 0$) and the attracting points of a_i and a_i^{-1} are at least r-apart from the repulsive hyperplanes of a_j and a_j^{-1}, for any $i \neq j$.

We have the following variant of the ping-pong lemma (see [12] 1.1).

Lemma 3.10. *If $a_1, \ldots, a_m \in PSL(V)$ form a ping-pong m-tuple, then they are free generators of a free group F_m.*

The following proposition explains how the above ingredients can be combined to yield a free group.

Proposition 3.11. *Given $a_1, \ldots, a_m \in PSL(V)$, an (m, r)-separating set F, and an ϵ-very contracting element γ (with $\epsilon < \frac{r}{2c^4}$, where c is the maximal bi-Lipschitz constant of $\{a_1, ..., a_m\} \cup F$), there are $h_1, \ldots, h_m \in F$ and*

$g_2, \ldots, g_m \in F$ such that

$$\gamma a_1 h_1,\ g_2\gamma a_2 h_2, \ldots,\ g_m \gamma a_m h_m$$

form a ping-pong m-tuple of $(\frac{r}{c}, c^3\epsilon)$-very proximal transformations and hence generate a free group F_m.

Proof. In this proof, whenever we speak about an ϵ-contracting or (r,ϵ)-proximal transformation, we shall choose and fix a point and a projective hyperplane with respect to which it is ϵ-contracting or (r,ϵ)-proximal and shall refer to them as the attracting point and the repulsive hyperplane of that transformation.

As γ is ϵ-very contracting, γa_1 is $c\epsilon$-very contracting. Now by proposition 3.8 (iii), we can find $h_1 \in F$ such that $\gamma a_1 h_1$ is $(\frac{r}{c}, c^2\epsilon)$-very proximal.

We proceed by induction and suppose that $x_1 = \gamma_1 a_1 h_1$ and $x_j = g_j \gamma a_j h_j$ have been constructed for all $j < i$ $(i = 2, ..., m)$. Let's construct h_i and g_i. First note that γa_i is $c\epsilon$-very contracting. We take $h_i \in F$ such that h_i^{-1} maps the attracting point of $(\gamma a_i)^{-1}$ at a distance at least r from the repulsive hyperplanes of all transformations x_j and x_j^{-1} for $j < i$, and h_i maps the attracting point of any x_j and x_j^{-1} $(j < i)$ at least r away from the repulsive hyperplane of γa_i. This is possible since F is an (m, r)-separating set. The second requirement for h_i implies that the repulsive hyperplane $H_{(\gamma a_i h_i)} = h_i^{-1}(H_{(\gamma a_i)})$ of $\gamma a_i h_i$ is at least r/c away from the attracting points of the x_j's and x_j^{-1}'s.

Then pick $g_i \in F$ which takes the attracting point of $\gamma a_i h_i$ at a distance at least r from the repulsive hyperplanes of all x_j's and x_j^{-1}'s for all $j < i$ and also from the repulsive hyperplane of $\gamma a_i h_i$, and whose inverse g_i^{-1} takes the attracting point of any x_j and x_j^{-1} $(j < i)$ at least r away from the repulsive hyperplane of $(\gamma a_i h_i)^{-1}$. This means that the repulsive hyperplane $g_i(H_{(\gamma a_i h_i)^{-1}}) = H_{(g_i \gamma a_i h_i)^{-1}}$ of $g_i \gamma a_i h_i$ is at least r/c away from the attracting points all x_j and x_j^{-1}. Additionally we can require that g_i^{-1} takes the attracting point of $(\gamma a_i h_i)^{-1}$ at a distance at least r from the repulsive hyperplane of $(\gamma a_i h_i)^{-1}$.

Then clearly, $x_i = g_i \gamma a_i h_i$ is $(\frac{r}{c}, c^3\epsilon)$-very proximal and $(x_1, ..., x_i)$ form a ping-pong i-tuple of $(\frac{r}{c}, c^3\epsilon)$-very proximal transformations. □

4. Constructing very proximal elements in Γ

Our aim in this section is to establish an action of Γ, on some projective space over a local field, which has many very proximal elements. Proposition 3.8 tells us how to get very proximal elements out of contracting elements when a separating set is available. We shall show how to construct an action of Γ, on a projective space over a local field, with both ingredients : contracting elements and separating set.

For an algebraic number field there are naturally associated local fields - its completions. The following lemma reduces the general case to this.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\mathbb{G}$ be a semisimple algebraic group defined over $\mathbb{Q}$, and $G = \mathbb{G}(\mathbb{R})^0$ be the corresponding connected semisimple Lie group. Let Γ be a finitely generated dense subgroup in G. Then, there exists a number field $K \subset \mathbb{R}$ and a group homomorphism $\pi : \Gamma \to \mathbb{G}$ such that $\pi(\Gamma) \subset \mathbb{G}(K)$ and $\pi(\Gamma)$ is still dense in G.*

Proof. Choose a finite set of generators $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_k$ such that γ_1, γ_2 are close to 1 and (γ_1, γ_2) belongs to the complement of the proper exponential algebraic set introduced in theorem 2.4. Let $\Gamma = \{\gamma_1, ..., \gamma_k \mid (r_\alpha)_\alpha\}$ be a presentation of Γ. The variety of representations

$$\mathrm{Hom}\big(\Gamma, \mathbb{G}\big) = \{(g_1, ..., g_k) \in \mathbb{G}^k : \forall \alpha,\ r_\alpha(g_1, ..., g_k) = 1\}$$

is an algebraic subvariety of $\mathbb{G}^k$ which is defined over $\mathbb{Q}$. Its set of algebraic points is therefore dense (for the real topology) in its set of real points. Choosing an algebraic point in $\mathrm{Hom}\big(\Gamma, \mathbb{G}(\mathbb{R})\big)$ very close to the original $(\gamma_1, ..., \gamma_k)$, we obtain a representation π of Γ into G such that $\pi(\Gamma)$ is contained in $\mathbb{G}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}})$ and is still dense in G, as small deformations of γ_1, γ_2 generate dense subgroups. Finally, since it is finitely generated, it is contained in $\mathbb{G}(K)$ for some number field K. □

As explained in the last section, "ε-contraction" is equivalent to "big ratio between the first and the second diagonal entries in the KAK decomposition."

Lemma 4.2 (Constructing contracting elements)**.** *Let K be a number field and $\mathbb{G}$ be a non-trivial semisimple Zariski-connected algebraic group defined over K. Let R be a finitely generated subring of K and I an infinite subset of $\mathbb{G}(R)$. Then for some completion k of K there is an irreducible rational representation $\rho : \mathbb{G} \to \mathbb{SL}(V)$ defined over k, with $\dim_k V \geq 2$, such that the set*

$$\left\{ \frac{|a_1\big(\rho(g)\big)|}{|a_2\big(\rho(g)\big)|} : g \in I \right\}$$

is unbounded, where $a_1\big(\rho(g)\big)$ and $a_2\big(\rho(g)\big)$ are the first and second diagonal terms in a Cartan decomposition of $\rho(g)$ in $\mathbb{SL}(V)$.

Proof. As R is finitely generated, the discrete diagonal embedding of K in its adèle group gives rise to a discrete embedding of R into a product of finitely many places. Explicitly, there is a finite set S of places of K, including all archimedean ones, such that R is contained in the ring of S-integers

$\mathcal{O}_K(S)$. Projecting to the finite product of places corresponding to S, we get a discrete embedding

$$R \hookrightarrow \prod_{\nu \in S} K_\nu,$$

which gives rise to a discrete embedding

$$\mathbb{G}(R) \hookrightarrow \prod_{\nu \in S} \mathbb{G}(K_\nu).$$

The infinite set I is mapped to some unbounded set in the latter product. Hence for some place $\nu \in S$, the embedding $\mathbb{G}(R) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{G}(K_\nu)$ sends I to an unbounded set. Take $k = K_v$. Since $\mathbb{G}$ is also defined over k, there exists a k-rational faithful representation of $\mathbb{G}$ on some k-vector space V_0. Under this representation, the set I is sent to some unbounded set in $\mathbb{SL}(V_0)$ which we shall continue to denote by I.

Fix a k-basis of V_0 and consider the Cartan decomposition in $\mathbb{SL}(V_0)$ corresponding to this basis. Recall the notations of section 3. For $x \in \mathbb{SL}(V_0)$, $|a_1(x)| \geq |a_2(x)| \geq \ldots \geq |a_d(x)| > 0$ denote the corresponding diagonal coefficients in the Cartan decomposition of x in $\mathbb{SL}(V_0)$. Since their product is 1, there is some i $(1 \leq i < d)$ for which the set $\{\frac{|a_i(g)|}{|a_{i+1}(g)|}\}_{g \in I}$ is unbounded.

Considering the i'th wedge product representation of the above representation of $\mathbb{G}$, we obtain a rational representation

$$\rho_0 : \mathbb{G} \to \mathbb{SL}(\bigwedge^i V_0)$$

defined over k. Looking at the Cartan decomposition in $\mathbb{SL}(\bigwedge^i V_0)$ with respect to the basis of $\bigwedge^i V_0$ induced by the given basis of V_0, we see that $a_1\big(\rho_0(x)\big) = a_1(x)...a_i(x)$ and $a_2\big(\rho_0(g)\big) = a_1(x)...a_{i-1}(x)a_{i+1}(x)$, and hence, under this representation, the set

$$\left\{ \frac{|a_1\big(\rho_0(g)\big)|}{|a_2\big(\rho_0(g)\big)|} \right\}_{g \in I}$$

is unbounded.

The representation ρ_0 might be reducible. However, as $\mathbb{G}(k)$ is a connected semisimple algebraic group, the k-rational representation ρ_0 is completely reducible. Let $W = \bigwedge^i V_0$ be the representation space. Decompose it into $\mathbb{G}(k)$-irreducible spaces $W = W_1 \oplus ... \oplus W_q$. Any $x = \rho_0(g) \in \rho_0\big(\mathbb{G}(k)\big) \leq \mathbb{SL}(W)$ stabilizes each W_i, and we shall write $x_i \in \mathbb{SL}(W_i)$ for its restriction to the subspace W_i (note that the determinant of x_i is 1 as $\mathbb{G}(k)$ is semisimple).

The space W is endowed with the norm $\|\cdot\|$ corresponding to the above choice of a basis of V_0 (as in section 3) for which $|a_1(g)| = \|g\|$ and $|a_1(g)a_2(g)| = \left\|\bigwedge^2 g\right\|$ for any $g \in \mathbb{SL}(W)$. Similarly we can choose a basis and corresponding norms $\|\cdot\|_i$ for each W_i such that

$$|a_1(x_i)| = \|x_i\|_i \text{ and } |a_1(x_i)a_2(x_i)| = \left\|\bigwedge^2 x_i\right\|_i.$$

As any two norms on the finite dimensional vector space $M_n(k)$, $\big(n = \dim(W)\big)$ are equivalent, there is $c_1 > 0$ with respect to which

$$\frac{1}{c_1}\max_{1\le j\le q}\{\|x_j\|_j\} \le \|x\| \le c_1 \max_{1\le j\le q}\{\|x_j\|_j\}.$$

Similarly, for some constant $c_2 > 0$

$$\frac{1}{c_2}\max_{i,j}\{\left\|(\bigwedge^2 x)_{ij}\right\|_{ij}\} \le \left\|\bigwedge^2 x\right\| \le c_2 \max_{i,j}\{\left\|(\bigwedge^2 x)_{ij}\right\|_{ij}\}.$$

Replacing I by an infinite subset if necessary, we can find an index $i_0 \le q$ with $\|x\| \le c_1 \|x_{i_0}\|_{i_0}$ for any x of the form $x = \rho_0(g)$, $g \in I$. As $\{\|\rho_0(g)\|\}_{g\in I}$ is unbounded, and each x_i belongs to $\mathbb{SL}(W_i)$, we must have $\dim W_{i_0} \ge 2$. Moreover, we have

$$\left\|\bigwedge^2 x\right\| \ge \frac{1}{c_2}\left\|(\bigwedge^2 x)_{ii}\right\|_{ii} = \frac{1}{c_2}\left\|\bigwedge^2 x_i\right\|_i,$$

which implies

$$\frac{|a_1(x)|}{|a_2(x)|} \le c_1^2 c_2 \frac{|a_1(x_{i_0})|}{|a_2(x_{i_0})|}.$$

Hence $\rho = (\rho_0)_{|Wi_0}$ is the desired rational irreducible representation.

□

Lemma 4.3 (Constructing separating sets)**.** *Let m be a positive integer, k a local field, $\mathbb{G}$ a Zariski-connected k-algebraic group, V a k-vector space, and $\rho : \mathbb{G} \to \mathbb{SL}(V)$ a k-irreducible rational representation. Then for any Zariski-dense subset $\Omega \subset \mathbb{G}(k)$, there exists a finite subset $F \subset \Omega$ and a positive real number $r > 0$, which gives rise under ρ to an (m, r)-separating set (cf. 3.7) on $\mathbb{P}(V)$.*

Proof. For each $\gamma \in \Gamma$, let M_γ be the set of all tuples $(v_i, H_i)_{i=1}^{2m}$ of $2m$ points $v_i \in \mathbb{P}(V)$ and $2m$ projective hyperplanes $H_i \subset \mathbb{P}(V)$, not necessarily different, such that for some $1 \le i, j \le 2m$, $\gamma \cdot v_i \in H_j$ or $\gamma^{-1} \cdot v_i \in H_i$.

We first claim that

$$\bigcap_{\gamma\in\Omega} M_\gamma = \emptyset. \tag{5}$$

Suppose this were not the case. Then there would exist $(v_i, H_i)_{i=1}^{2m}$ such that

$$\Omega \subset \bigcup_{1\leq i,j\leq 2m} \left\{\gamma \in \mathbb{G}(k), \gamma \cdot v_i \in H_j \text{ or } \gamma^{-1} \cdot v_i \in H_j\right\}.$$

The sets $\{\gamma \in \mathbb{G}(k) : \gamma \cdot v_i \in H_j\}$ and $\{\gamma^{-1} \in \mathbb{G}(k) : \gamma \cdot v_i \in H_j\}$ are clearly Zariski-closed and proper, since $\mathbb{G}(k)$ acts irreducibly on V. As $\mathbb{G}(k)$ is Zariski-connected, this yields a contradiction. Thus we have (5).

Second, as the sets M_γ are compact in the appropriate product of grassmannians, there is a finite subset $F \subset \Omega$, such that

$$\bigcap_{\gamma\in F} M_\gamma = \emptyset. \tag{6}$$

The following MaxMin of continuous functions

$$\max_{\gamma\in F}\Big(\min_{1\leq i,j\leq 2m}\{d(\gamma \cdot v_i, H_j), d(\gamma^{-1} \cdot v_i, H_j)\}\Big) \tag{7}$$

depends continuously on $(v_i, H_i)_{i=1}^{2m}$, and by (6) never vanishes. Finally, the compactness of the set of all tuples $(v_i, H_i)_{i=1}^{2m}$ in

$$\big(\mathbb{P}(V) \times \mathbb{G}r_{\dim(V)-1}(V)\big)^{2m}$$

implies that (7) attains a positive minimum r. Thus F gives rise to the desired (m, r)-separating set. □

Putting together proposition 3.8 with lemmas 4.2 and 4.3, we obtain a great liberty in the choice of very contracting (or very proximal) elements in Γ.

Lemma 4.4. *Let m be a positive integer, K a number field, $\mathbb{G}$ a Zariski-connected semisimple K-algebraic group, $R \subset K$ a finitely generated subring, $I \subset \mathbb{G}(R)$ an infinite subset, and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{G}(K)$ a Zariski-dense subset of $\mathbb{G}$. Then there exist:*

- *An embedding $\sigma : K \hookrightarrow k$ of K into some local field k.*
- *An irreducible rational representation $\rho : \mathbb{G} \to \mathbb{SL}(V)$ defined over k,*
- *A finite (m, r)-separating set $F \subset \Omega$ (for some $r > 0$) for the action induced by ρ on the projective space $\mathbb{P}(V)$,*

such that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $g \in I$ and $f \in F$ for which gfg^{-1} acts as an ε-very contracting transformation on $\mathbb{P}(V)$.

Proof. Lemma (4.2) yields the local field k, the embedding $K \hookrightarrow k$, and the representation ρ, while lemma (4.3) yields the r-separating set $F \subset \Omega$.

For any $\varepsilon > 0$, we can find $g \in I$ with

$$\frac{a_1\big(\rho(g)\big)}{a_2\big(\rho(g)\big)} \geq \frac{r}{\epsilon\sqrt{2Cd}}$$

where $C = \max\{\text{biLip}(f) : f \in F\}$ and d is as in proposition (3.8) ($= 4$ in archimedean case, $\frac{1}{|\pi|}$ in the non-archimedean case). By lemma (3.3), g acts as a $\frac{\epsilon\sqrt{2Cd}}{r}$-contracting transformation on $\mathbb{P}(V)$. Finally, for ϵ small enough, proposition (3.8) provides $f \in F$ such that gfg^{-1} is ϵ-very contracting. □

Finally, we obtain the following result:

Theorem 4.5. *Let $\mathbb{G}$ be a Zariski connected semisimple algebraic K-group, where K is a number field. Let R be a finitely generated subring of K, and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{G}(R)$ a Zariski dense subset of $\mathbb{G}$ with $\Omega = \Omega^{-1}$. Then for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $a_1, \ldots, a_m \in \mathbb{G}(K)$ there are $x_1, \ldots, x_m$ with $x_i \in \Omega^4 a_i \Omega$ which are generators of a free group F_m.*

Proof. This follows from the combination of lemma 4.4 and proposition 3.11. □

Remark 4.6. Note that the original statement of Tits' alternative ([12], theorem 1) can be easily derived from the last theorem, first by taking a homomorphism of Γ into $\mathbb{GL}_n(K)$, for some number field K, whose image is not almost solvable (this is possible as the index of the solvable subgroup of an almost solvable group and the length of the derived series of solvable groups are both uniformly bounded for groups contained in $\mathbb{GL}_n$) and then projecting to a semisimple factor of the Zariski closure. Then take $\Omega = \Gamma$ in the last theorem.

5. Proofs of theorems 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3

To complete the proofs of the main results of this paper, we shall need some preliminary lemmas.

Lemma 5.1. *Let G be a connected real Lie group and $\Gamma \subset G$ a dense subgroup. Then Γ is generated by $\Gamma \cap U$, for any identity neighborhood U in G.*

Proof. Let H be the subgroup of G generated by $\Gamma \cap U$. Since Γ is dense and G connected, H is again dense in G. If $\gamma \in \Gamma$ we can thus find $h \in H$ such that $h \in \gamma U$. But then $\gamma^{-1}h \in \Gamma \cap U \subset H$. Hence $\Gamma = H$. □

Lemma 5.2. *Let $\mathbb{G}$ be a Zariski-connected algebraic group defined over $\mathbb{R}$ and let $G = \mathbb{G}(\mathbb{R})^0$ be the corresponding connected real Lie group. Let Γ be a dense subgroup in G and $\pi : \Gamma \to G$ a group homomorphism such that $\pi(\Gamma)$ is Zariski-dense. Then for any identity neighborhood $U \subset G$, $\pi(U \cap \Gamma)$ is Zariski-dense in $\mathbb{G}$.*

Proof. Let $(U_n)_n$, $U_n \supset U_{n+1}$, be a nested sequence of identity neighborhoods in G, such that for any identity neighborhood U, $U_n \subset U$ for large n's. Let $U'_n = U_n \cap \Gamma$ and let X_n be the Zariski closure of $\pi(U'_n)$ in G. Since $(X_n)_n$ is a decreasing sequence of Zariski-closed subsets of G, it stabilizes at some finite step n_0. For any $g \in U'_{n_0}$, $gU'_n \subset U'_{n_0}$, for n large enough, hence $\pi(g)X_{n_0} = \pi(g)X_n \subset X_{n_0}$. By lemma 5.1, U'_{n_0} generates Γ, hence $\pi(\Gamma)X_{n_0} \subset X_{n_0}$. Since $\pi(\Gamma)$ is Zariski dense, this implies $X_{n_0} = G$. Thus $\pi(U \cap \Gamma)$ is Zariski-dense for any identity neighborhood $U \subset G$. □

Proof of theorem 1.1. The adjoint group $H = \mathrm{Ad}(G)$ is a center free connected semisimple Lie group, hence is of the form $\mathbb{H}(\mathbb{R})^0$ where $\mathbb{H}$ is some Zariski-connected semisimple $\mathbb{Q}$-algebraic group.

By Corollary 2.5, we can assume that Γ is finitely generated. By lemma 4.1, there is a homomorphism π of Γ into $\mathrm{Ad}(G)$ with dense, hence Zariski-dense, image which lies in $\mathbb{H}(K)$ for some number field K. Since Γ is finitely generated, there is a finitely generated subring R of K, such that $\pi(\Gamma) \subset \mathbb{H}(R)$.

Consider two elements a and b in Γ and a sufficiently small identity neighborhood U' in G such that for any $x \in V(a) := U'aU'$ and $y \in V(b) := U'bU'$, $\langle x, y\rangle$ is a dense subgroup of G. By theorem 2.4 this is always possible. Let U be a smaller symmetric identity neighborhood in G such that $U^4 \subset U'$ and denote

$$\Omega = \pi(\Gamma \cap U).$$

By lemma 5.2, the conditions of theorem 4.5 are fulfilled. We thus obtain the desired dense free subgroup.

□

The proof of theorem 1.2 is basically the same as the proof of theorem 1.1 and we shall not go over it again, but only describe the needed modifications in the above argument.

Proof of theorem 1.2 (outline). Pick $a_1, \ldots, a_m \in \Gamma$ close to the identity, and a small symmetric identity neighborhood U such that for any selection $x_i \in U^4 a_i U$, $i = 1, \ldots, m$, the group $\langle x_1, \ldots, x_m\rangle$ is dense in G. The existence of such a_i's and U is an easy consequence of theorem 2.1.

Now project G on the semisimple quotient $S = G/R$ where R is the radical of G, and find as above a projective space over a local field and an action of Γ (via S) for which there is

- a (m, r)-separating set $F \subset U \cap \Gamma$ (for some $r > 0$), and

- for $\epsilon < \frac{r}{2c^4}$, (where c is the maximal bi-Lipschitz constant of $\{a_1, ..., a_m\} \cup F$ when acting on the projective space), an element $\gamma_\epsilon \subset U^3 \cap \Gamma$ acting as an ϵ-very contracting element.

Then there are

$$h_i \in F \ (1 \leq i \leq m) \text{ and } g_i \in F \ (2 \leq i \leq m),$$

such that

$$\langle \gamma_\epsilon a_1 h_1, \ g_2 \gamma_\epsilon a_2 h_2, \ldots, \ g_m \gamma_\epsilon a_m h_m \rangle$$

is dense and free. □

Proof of theorem 1.3. Recall that G is a connected non-solvable Lie group and $\Gamma \leq G$ is a finitely generated dense subgroup. Define $G_0 = G$ and $G_n = \overline{[G_{n-1}, G_{n-1}]}$. Then as $\dim(G) < \infty$ the sequence G_n stabilizes at some finite step k, $H = G_k$ is a connected topologically perfect closed normal subgroup of G, and the quotient G/H is solvable. Moreover it follows by induction on n that $\Gamma \cap G_n$ is dense in G_n.

Let l be the codimension of H and let m be the minimal number of generators of the Lie algebra of H, then $l+m \leq \dim(G)$. Since the projection of Γ to G/H is finitely generated and dense, proposition 2.7 implies that it contains $2l$ elements which generate a dense subgroup in G/H. Let $a_1, \ldots, a_{2l} \in \Gamma$ be arbitrary lifts of these elements. Additionally, as in the proof of theorem 1.2, let $a_{2l+1}, \ldots, a_{2l+m}$ be m elements in $H \cap \Gamma$ near the identity, and let $U \subset H$ be a small identity neighborhood of H, such that for any selection $x_i \in U^4 a_i U$ $(2l+1 \leq i \leq 2l+m)$, the group $\langle x_{2l+1}, \ldots, x_{2l+m} \rangle$ is dense in H. Then for any selection $x_i \in U^4 a_i U$ $(1 \leq i \leq 2l+m)$ the group $\langle x_1, \ldots, x_{2l+m} \rangle$ is dense in G.

From this point, we can continue exactly as in the proof of theorem 1.2 in order to find x_i's such that $\langle x_1, \ldots, x_{2l+m} \rangle$ is free. □

Remark 5.1. *The bound* $2\dim(G)$ *is not sharp as the latter proof shows. But* $2l+m$ *can also be decreased in some cases. For example, it is easy to see that if* G *is a direct product of a semisimple group with* $\mathbb{R}^d$*, then* $\max\{2, 2d\}$ *is the sharp bound for theorem 1.3.*

Acknowledgments 5.1. We would like to thank A. Lubotzky, from whom we learned about the question, as well as G.A. Margulis for their help and support while working on this paper. We are also thankful to Y. Benoist and S. Mozes for many valuable discussions and comments and to Y. Guivarc'h for pointing out to us the work of Carrière and Ghys and the link with the theory of amenable actions.

References

[1] Abels, H.; Margulis, G. A.; Soifer, G. A. Semigroups containing proximal linear maps, *Israel J. Math.* **91** (1995), no. 1-3, 1–30.

[2] Benoist, Y. Propriétés asymptotiques des groupes linéaires, GAFA, Geom. Funct. Anal. **7** (1997), 1-47.

[3] Bourbaki, N. *Groupes et algèbres de Lie*, chapitres 7 et 8, Hermann, 1975.

[4] Bruhat, F. ; Tits, J. Groupes réductifs sur un corps local, I. Données radicielles valuées, *Publ. math. IHES* **41** (1972).

[5] De la Harpe, P. *Topics in Geometrical Group Theory*, Chicago University Press, (2000).

[6] De la Harpe, P., Free Groups in Linear Groups, *L'Enseignement Mathématique*, **29** (1983), 129-144.

[7] Epstein, D.B.A., Almost all subgroups of a Lie group are free, *J. of Algebra.* **19** (1971) 261-262.

[8] Carrière, Y., Ghys, E., Relations d'équivalence moyennables sur les groupes de Lie, CRAS **300** (1985), no. 19, 677–680.

[9] Kuranishi, M. On everywhere dense embedding of free groups in Lie groups, *Nagoya Math.* **J 2** (1951), 63-71.

[10] Platonov, V., Rapinchuk, A., *Algebraic Groups and Number Theory*, Academic Press, 1994.

[11] Raghunathan, M.S. *Discrete Subgroups of Lie Groups, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und Ihrer Grenzgebiete*. Band **68** (1972).

[12] Tits, J. Free subgroups of Linear groups, *Journal of Algebra* **20** (1972), 250-270.

[13] Zimmer, B. Amenable actions and dense subgroups of Lie groups, *Journal of Functional analysis*, **72** (1987), no. 1, 58–64